

Sveučilište u Zagrebu

Filozofski fakultet

Odsjek za anglistiku

Nastavnički smjer

Jezično nazadovanje u engleskom jeziku – uzroci i posljedice

Diplomski rad

Povjerenstvo za obranu:

dr. sc. Jelena Mihaljević -Djigunović, red. prof.

dr.sc. Marta Medved-Krajnović, izv. prof.

Stela Letica Krevelj, asistent

Student: Dorotea Lamot

Mentor: dr. sc. Marta Medved- Krajnović, izv. prof.

Zagreb, lipanj 2014.

University of Zagreb
Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences
Department of English
SLA and TEFL Section

Attrition in English as a foreign language – causes and consequences

Diploma Paper

Defensecommittee:

Jelena Mihaljević- Djigunovic, Professor

Marta Medved- Krajnovic, Professor

Stela Letica Krevelj, researchassistant

Student: Dorotea Lamot

Supervisor: Professor Marta Medved-Krajnović, Ph.D

Zagreb, June, 2014

Abstract

The study aims to define the linguistic phenomenon of language attrition and explore its causes and consequences by using data from quantitative and qualitative questionnaires. The study on first language attrition was conducted in December 2013 among 9 participants, all of whom consider Croatian as their first language and it relies on the data from the questionnaire based on self-evaluation. The participants were asked about their approach towards their L1 after leaving their home country, frequency of use of their L1 and their own assessment of the level of knowledge. The findings confirm the researcher's assumption that the approach and personal relationship towards a language have a strong influence on the effects of language attrition. However, no matter how strong the connection to one's L1, each of the participants admitted their level of L1 knowledge was lower than while they lived in their home country, which implies that a certain degree of attrition must have taken place. The study on second language attrition was also conducted in December 2013 among 15 participants in Zagreb. The aim was to determine the current level of knowledge of Italian (which was a second language for all the participants) and compare it to the presumed level of knowledge the participants had while in the process of learning Italian. Different aspects of language use were explored in order to try to decide whether the second language underwent attrition. Quantitative data and the participants' personal impressions showed that their level of knowledge is at least twice as bad today than it used to be, the cause of this mostly being language negligence. Finally, the degree of language attrition varies and it depends on many factors. Even though this paper focuses only on some of them, all should be included in further research.

Keywords – first language attrition, second language attrition, self-evaluation, language negligence

Contents

Introduction	6
L1 attrition	
Definition	7
L2 influence and L1 attrition.....	8
Causes of attrition and factors involved in the process of attrition	10
Children vs. adults	12
Expressing emotions during the process of L1 attrition	12
L2 attrition	14
Consequences of language attrition	15
Study of L1 attrition	
Aims	16
Sample	16
Instruments	18
Procedure	19
Results	19
Participants' personal impressions	28
Final thought on the study	29
Study of L2 attrition	
Aims	30
Sample	30
Instruments	30
Procedure	31

Results	31
Participants' personal impressions	34
Final thought on the study	35
Conclusion and suggestion for further research	36
Sažetak	37
Reference List	38
Appendix A	41
Appendix B	50

Introduction

Language attrition may sound as a very drastic linguistic phenomena, at least, it did so to me. However, while working on this paper, I slowly started to realize that language attrition is very subtle and difficult to trace. It does not relate only to the stage in which you can no longer use the language you used to know; actually, every decline in the proficiency of language use can actually be considered a phase of language attrition.

I will use this diploma paper to try to give the broadest possible definition of language attrition because, when compared to other linguistic phenomena, it is still relatively under researched. The theoretical part will cover some of the factors that influence language attrition, those which cause and foster the process. Two studies will be presented, one that focuses on L1 attrition and the other that focuses on L2 attrition, so as to see the differences, similarities and other aspects of both processes. The relationship between a person's L1 and L2 will be explored, and the influence that the L2, if it becomes dominant, has on the L1. During writing I was interested in the difference between language attrition in a child and an adult, too. What causes language attrition in those cases? How is it manifested? I was also interested in the relationship between expressing emotions in different languages and language attrition, so there is a chapter on this topic as well.

Within each mentioned study, I pointed out the aim, analyzed the sample, explained the procedure, and briefly discussed some of the statements. I also included participants' personal impressions which provided an additional insight into the process.

In the end, there is a conclusion with suggestions for further research.

L1 Attrition

Definition

Today we still cannot speak of what language attrition IS, but of what it MIGHT BE. Although a lot of research has been conducted in the last twenty years, researchers are still not completely certain at which stage language attrition can be recognized and how it should be defined. Can we forget a language completely? What notions does this word ‘forget’ include? Does it just affect vocabulary production or comprehension as well? What else? How can we test it?

Although it is mostly visible in radical cases of vocabulary loss, attrition affects other aspects of language production and comprehension which cannot be so easily detected. Barbara Kopke and Monika Schmid categorized the issues concerning language attrition identification as following: theoretical problems, methodological problems, lack of communication between researchers and finally ‘extraordinary complexity and multi-facetedness of the phenomenon of language attrition’ (Schmid, Kopke, Keijzer, Weimar 2004:2). Van Els distinguishes between two types of attrition: according to language lost (L1, L2) and linguistic environment (L1 environment and L2 environment) which is shown in Figure 1. (vanEls 1986:9). Dialect loss and language reversion are not (yet) considered to be a part of attrition studies.

Figure 1. The ‘van Els taxonomy’

Language lost	Linguistic environment	
	L1	L2
L1	Dialect loss	L1 attrition
L2	L2 attrition	Language reversion

L2 influence and L1 attrition

L1 attrition is a phenomenon which should be examined with a great deal of caution. Although some linguistic processes appear as a sign of language attrition, this may not always be the case. Pavlenko (2000) differentiates between five different processes that occur when two languages are in interaction – borrowing, restructuring, convergence, shift and, finally, attrition. Each of the processes and the extent to which they can be seen as evidence of language attrition will be briefly explained as follows.

Borrowing

In general, lexical borrowing is a process of using L2 words in L1 communication and this might be perceived as a sign of L1 attrition. However, Pavlenko argues that it is not as plain as that. She gives the example of a Russian L2 user of English in the USA who mostly used phonologically and morphologically adjusted lexical borrowings. However, it was later pinned down that most of those words (*intruzivnost* ‘intrusiveness’, *dauntaun* ‘downtown’, *lendlord* ‘landlord’) do not even exist in Russian. Bearing this in mind, she argues that when it comes to borrowing, we can only talk about real language attrition if the person used a L2 word for an object or a concept that does have an equivalent in their L1, regardless of the fact whether it was used in comprehension or production.

Restructuring

Restructuring is a process according to which some elements from L1 are deleted and they are then replaced by elements from L2. This process most often appears in morphosyntax when a L2 user applies L2 rules to L1 grammar. Is it easy to notice this type of phenomenon in the areas of case-, gender- and number- marking, preposition choices and word order. Laufer (2003) presented a research on Russian immigrants in Israel who were given a number of different collocations but were unable to detect which of them were incorrect. Although the correct expression in Russian is *to turn off the TV*, they chose *to close the TV*, which is a Hebrew pattern for this particular expression. This was a clear example of restructuring because they took a rule from their L2 and incorporated it into their L1.

So, in order to consider it as evidence of attrition, restructuring has to be manifested in at least two ways: first, through grammaticality and semantic judgments that are different from those expressed by a monolingual L1 user, and second, through noticeable processing delays in production and difficulties in comprehension.

Convergence

Pavlenko argues that as a process which does take place in the interaction between two languages, convergence shows certain cues which could suggest that L1 attrition is present. Best area for documenting convergence is shown to be phonology because the differences of pronouncing one's L1 and L2 can be examined through voice onset time (VOT), a feature of production of stop consonants. The values of VOT are in great correlation with the notion of sounding 'native'. However, in order to consider convergence as one of the examples of language attrition, evidence of steady effects that are introduced systematically in more contexts is required

Shift

The fourth of the processes indicated by the Crosslinguistic Influence framework points to a user's step away from L1 structures and values towards the ones specific for the L2. Tao and Thompson (1991) gave the example of a L2 Mandarin user of English who, when talking to a Mandarin speaker, used a lot of backchannel strategies¹ of American English origin such as 'uh-huh' or 'hmm'. In order to decide whether shift can serve as an evidence of language attrition in a certain context, the examination has to be done in a monolingual L1 context and the results have to be compared to the ones given by bilingual participants.

Attrition

Regardless of the fact whether it is permanent or temporary, Pavlenko gives a couple of characteristics of L1 attrition:

- Relatively permanent restructuring
- Presence of convergence
- Loss of L1 phonological and morphosyntactic rules (stage in which L2 user would no longer be recognized as native speaker of their L1 when talking to monolingual L1 speakers)
- Loss of L1 vocabulary (in L1 environment, a person will use very basic vocabulary)

¹Backchannel strategies are listener's responses to the speaker which can be verbal and nonverbal.

- Loss of L1 concepts
- Disability to classify words into categories
- Significant loss of conversational conventions (backchannel)

To be able to classify a stage as attrition it is important that all of these characteristics are exhibited in monolingual L1 context in both production and comprehension.

Causes of attrition and factors involved in the process of attrition

Attrition itself goes through different stages. For example, if a child moves to a L2 environment, their L1 will get into a stage of continuous attrition. However, what is left of L1 knowledge after some six years, is most likely to stay for many years to come. This L1 knowledge that is not lost after the sixth year is called **‘permastore content’** (Bahrick 1984:105-118). Research done by Bahrick (1984: 105-116) showed that within the period of 50 years a certain amount of knowledge remained intact. Moreover, a notion of **‘critical threshold’** was introduced by a famous scholar Neisser (1984) which points out to a moment after which all the knowledge that was preserved shall stay that way, meaning it would no longer attrite. He says that this information is “integrated into an extensive and redundant cognitive structure” which “is sharply resistant to forgetting” (Neisser 1984:34). In cases when critical threshold was not attained by the time the language was stopped being used, reactivation of any sort and at any time would have been much slower.

Kaufman (2001:185) claims that there is a difference between L1 attrition in pre-puberty children and among older children and adults. Since critical period hypothesis introduces the idea that, because of brain maturity limit, L2 learning can become aggravated after a certain point, he thinks that the same factors which influence this process might influence the process of attrition by making it slower. Furthermore, Harley and Wang (1997) added that sensitive period hypothesis (estimated to take part at the age 6 or 7) could be connected to the process of attrition even closer than critical period hypothesis because it is based on the idea that the easier it is for a child to learn a L2, the more likely they will forget their L1. This means that it takes a certain period of time before brain completely acquires a certain language as the first

language and while that process is still ongoing, L1 can be relatively easily replaced by some other language.

The above written indicates that **age** is one of the most quoted factors in language attrition research. According to many researchers (Kaufman, Harley and Wang included), the attrition will be more intensive if the speaker is removed from their L1 speaking environment before puberty. Furthermore, Hansen states in his study (Hansen & Reetz-Kurashige 1999:6) that children who were regarded as fluent in their L2 (Hindi-Urdu) at preschool in India, had almost no knowledge of the language (Hindi-Urdu) 20 years after, whereas their mother which had poor knowledge at the time of their preschool, preserved much more. This happened because children's sensitive period of language acquisition was not completed. According to some Berman & Olshtain (1983), Kuhberg (1992), Olshtain (1986), the attrition present in children who were taken away from their L1 environment before age 11 or 12 was very drastic. It was so radical that during the research no psycholinguistic or neurolinguistic method was able to identify any trace of L1. The reason this information is so reliable is because nothing similar has ever been recorded in adults, or rather anyone who left their L1 environment any time after ages 11, 12 (after puberty). Language attrition in adults is very low. The research results suggest that age is one of the most important factors – the older the child is, the attrition process will be less severe.

When it comes to the **level of education**, those subjects who had higher levels of training would suffer smaller amount of language loss when compared to those who did not have high levels of training. Although it is hard to distinguish whether someone's poor performance is a result of language attrition or merely their own language performance skills in general, Jaspaert & Kroon (1989) argue that level of education was the most important factor in the research they conducted, especially in the areas of text editing and vocabulary. Waas, on the other hand, reported that in his research education level influenced verbal fluency in the L1 (Waas, 1996). The final conclusion of these and other studies is that this extralinguistic variable still needs further research.

Another factor worth mentioning is **the length of time** since the start of attrition. When a person changes language environment from L1 to L2, over the time it becomes easier for them to access L2 than L1. However, research has shown that this factor can be taken into consideration only in cases when there is absolutely no further contact with L1 after leaving

the L1 environment. When people leave L1 environment with their families, for example, and continue using their L1 for many years after entering L2 environment, their L1 will not suffer severe language attrition and will remain relatively stable for usage.

Finally, we still did not pay attention to the emotional connection to learning a language. Some linguists argue that **motivation and attitude** towards language play a significant role in the process of language attrition. Others argue that it has much to do with self-perception, but that it does not affect proficiency. Although no firm evidence has been presented as to whether motivation and attitude actually influence language attrition, linguists agree that these factors are important and require further investigation.

Children vs. Adults

I already pointed out that puberty is a turning point in language stabilization. The process of language acquisition starts the day the child is born. However, if the child is removed from its L1 environment before puberty, the results in language attrition will be severe. According to recent researches on the topic of language attrition in children (Berman & Olshtain 1983; Kuhberg 1992; Olshtain 1986), the attrition present in children who were taken away from their L1 environment before age 11 or 12 was very drastic. It was so radical that during the research no psycholinguistic or neurolinguistic method was able to identify any trace of L1. The reason this information is so reliable is because nothing similar has ever been recorded in adults, or rather anyone who left their L1 environment any time after ages 11, 12 (after puberty). Language attrition in adults is very low. The research results suggest that age is one of the most important factors – the older the child is attrition will be less severe.

Expressing emotions during the process of L1 attrition

How emotions are expressed in a L2 has been a very interesting topic for many researchers and the concept of L1 attrition adds another dimension to it. Some say that the longer they stayed in L2 environment they grew more accustomed to expressing their feelings in this other language. This is something one would presume when taking into consideration all the characteristics of language attrition we have already mentioned. However, Jean-Marc Dewaele gives us an example of a woman, Ana Soter who was born in Austria but moved to

Australia at the age of 6. She says that her attrited German comes back to her only when she's writing about emotions (prose or poetry). According to Bond & Lai (1986) many people feel that their second language is not *their* enough to be able to express their deepest emotions, it somehow feels distant to them in this manner. Moreover, very notable information came from multilingual writers and linguists such as Julia Alvarez who after years of professionally using English still feels her true self when talking in Spanish.

"Spanish certainly was the language of storytelling, the language of the body and the senses and of the emotional wiring of the child, so that still, when someone addresses me as "Hoolia" (Spanish pronunciation of Julia), I feel my emotional self come to the fore. I answer Si, and lean forward to kiss a cheek rather than answer Yes and extend my hand for a handshake, Some deeper or first Julia is being summoned."

(Alvarez, in Novakovich & Shapard 2000:218)

On the other hand, the same reason –feeling of your L1 being the closest to your true self– causes some people not to use it deliberately. Josip Novakovich gives his own reason for never writing in his native language.

"In my own case, English words didn't carry the political and emotional baggage of repressive upbringing, so I could say whatever I wanted without provoking childhood demons, to which Croatian words were still chained, to tug at me and to make me cringe."

(Josip Novakovich, in Novakovich & Shapard 2000:16)

Linguists suggest that the relationship between emotions and native language is very complicated and profound because even with all the characteristics of attrition present, it seems that emotional connotations are still very strong in L1.

Another nuance of this phenomenon is called conceptual attrition (Pavlenko 2002, 2003a, b). The stage in which a language which used to be someone's L1 is no longer adequate to express emotions and thoughts is not only a result of language attrition but also a result of conceptual attrition. The basis of this theory is the fact that alongside language, culture changes as well when a person moves to another country. Some concepts are no longer translatable because they do not even exist in another country, they don't even have a word for it. Examples such as these are numerous.

L2 Attrition

A research on L2 attrition was conducted by Bahrick (1984) on a sample of 587 Americans who learned Spanish at some point between one and fifty years prior to being tested. The results showed that a certain amount of knowledge is lost within the first few years of not using the language, but whatever is left after those few years is almost certain to stay in the memory of a person for the next fifty years or even longer. Receptive skills were on a higher level than productive, regardless of the fact whether it was related to vocabulary or grammar rules. Furthermore, Bahrick claims that if minimal effort is put into using the language for any period of time, a large amount of information can be saved in memory.

When it comes to the attrition of a language learned in school for four years, the situation is rather different. The research showed a small amount of attrition and at certain areas even some gains. Users had very good results in reading and listening and attrition was mostly visible in the field of morph-syntax. When it comes to participants themselves, every single one of them exaggerated in the estimation of their own knowledge. Weltens, Van Elss and Schils (1989:214) argue that the reason for such a small amount of attrition is cognitive maturation, continuing education and learning other languages over the time.

However, soon after these studies, linguists decided that the tests should focus on language production in order to give more valuable information about the process of attrition. Cohen (1989) designed a task where two Portuguese children (ages 10 and 14) were to retell a story a month after returning from Portuguese-speaking environment – Brazil, three months after and then nine months after the return. Although European Portuguese and Brazilian Portuguese are two linguistic norms of the same language and they are still not considered different languages, there are many differences in the vocabulary that have to be taken into consideration in this respect. It is precisely in this area that the children displayed gradual loss in their L2 (the Brazilian norm) over the course of time, as it was demonstrated during the three sessions.

Consequences of language attrition

There are a couple of phenomena that can appear as a result of language attrition. Some of them seem benign and unalarming, however, some can point to the final and most radical consequence of language attrition –complete inability to recall any knowledge of the language.

Weltens (1989) argues that the ‘tip of the tongue’ phenomenon is common among bilinguals, or rather people who have one language influencing the other. He states that people experiencing this feeling have still not lost the knowledge of the vocabulary; however, when confronted with a production task it takes them much longer to retrieve a certain word or an expression. This brings us to the conclusion that there are stages in accessing certain areas of knowledge. Taking this into consideration, he argues that attrition has influenced the speed of retrieving the forgotten words, but the comprehension is usually still in order.

Although some linguists believe that the final and most radical consequence of language attrition is complete loss of language knowledge in one’s mind, more and more are inclined to believe that the final result of language attrition is not complete loss but severe inaccessibility of linguistic information. There were a couple of studies which showed that people were able to retrieve a language from their early childhood (they were never aware they knew) under hypnosis (Fromm, 1970). This type of studies serves as a strong indication that language once acquired, regardless of the fact whether a person is aware of it or not, stays in one’s brain as long as they live.

STUDY OF L1 ATTRITION

Aims

The two main aims of this study were:

- to compare levels of knowledge before the phenomenon of language attrition started and after it;
- to identify factors that influenced language attrition and circumstances under which it happened.

Two sets of questions were designed in order to explore if and how L1 and L2 attrition differ. Does L2 environment affect L1 deeply? In which areas is this noticeable? How do people feel about their L1 after spending years in L2 environment? Does this emotional link have any impact on attrition and condition of their L1? All of these and many other questions were raised during the research.

Sample

The sample comprises a group of 9 participants who grew up in Croatia and consider Croatian to be their L1. After a certain period of time, they left Croatia and went live abroad. Since all of them lived in Croatia after at least puberty, they are called 'late bilinguals' or 'sequential bilinguals' (Schmid, Kopke, Keijzer, Weimar 2004:260).

Six respondents were female and three were male. Around half of them were born in the 80s and the other half in the 50s. The first half left Croatia only a couple of years ago, whereas the other half left in the 80s which means they have spent last 30 years living out of Croatia. There are also differences between the levels of education of these two subgroups: three out of four participants from the younger group have college education, whereas all four participants from the older group graduated from vocational schools. Furthermore, younger group have learned more foreign languages throughout their education (English, German, Italian, Spanish, French, Latin) which may also influence their attitude towards learning and/or forgetting a language. Two out of all nine had absolutely no knowledge of the language of the

country they moved to before they came there. Other seven learned their L2 approximately 7 years (the languages are mostly English and German) prior to moving.

The following tables show characteristics of the sample more systematically.

Table 1 – Distribution of sample by gender

	Number of participants
Male	3
Female	6

Table 2 – Distribution of sample by place of birth

	Number of participants
Zagreb	4
Varaždin	1
Derventa (BIH)	1
Ljubuški (BIH)	2
Prijedor (BIH)	1

Table 3 – Distribution of sample by the date of birth (in decades)

	Number of participants
50s	3
70s	1
80s	5

Table 4 – Distribution of sample by the date of leaving Croatia (in decades)

	Number of participants
70s	1
80s	2
90s	1

2000 - 2010	2
2010 - 2020	3

Table 5 – Distribution of sample by level of education

	Number of participants
Secondary school	5
BA	3
MA	1

Instruments

In this study a questionnaire was used (see Appendix 1) that elicited both quantitative and qualitative data. The participants were given an introduction about the aims of the research and instructions for the questionnaire. Most of the questions were made according to the sample of questions for language attrition research Merel Keijzer constructed (<http://www.let.rug.nl/languageattrition/>), but some additional questions were added because they seemed specifically interesting for the topic of this paper. The first part of the questionnaire offers information on personal and general data about each participant: age, gender, place and date of birth, level of education, experience in learning language, time of leaving Croatia, current occupation, marital status etc. The following section gives us information about the nature of their departure, experience in learning the target language, attitude towards Croatian language and culture in another environment, different types of communication with different people in their lives etc. Finally, the participants were asked to assess their own level of knowledge of both Croatian and their new dominant language when they first came to the other country and today.

Procedure

Since all of the participants live abroad, the study was conducted via e-mail and all questionnaires are available for checking and further analysis. The questionnaires were filled out between 29 November 2013 and 8 December 2013.

Results

The main goal of this questionnaire was to elicit information about people's own feelings of the status of their first language after a period of time abroad. Self-evaluation questionnaires are not the most reliable instrument to obtain specific information about language attrition, put it into a specific time-frame or identify the level of knowledge of a language with great precision. However, these questionnaires are very valuable as a starting point or stimulus to conduct more research on the topic because they indicate beyond any doubt that in a course of time spent in a foreign speaking environment, L1 does appear to be in a stage of attrition.

Since there was a difference between the majority of answers and attitude in the groups based on date of birth (which then also coincided with the time of departure from Croatia), sometimes the distinctions in this paper will be made based on this division. For that purposes I will address them as Group A and Group B. Group A is comprised of younger people, all of whom were born in in the 80s and who left Croatia between 2005 and 2012. Four out of five of them have college education and in the course of their whole education, on average, they learned more languages for a longer period of time per person than recorded in Group B. Furthermore, after they left Croatia, they spent at least a year in at least one other country (Germany, Spain, Italy, USA, Mauritius) other than their present country of residence and their home country. Group B includes older people, born mostly in the 50s who left Croatia (or rather Yugoslavia) in the 80s (on average) which means that they have spent the last 30 years away from their home country. All of them graduated from vocational schools and never lived anywhere else besides Croatia and the country they live in now. The distinction according to education was made as well because Jaspaert & Kroon (1989) stressed out that education was one of the most important variables in their studies.

It is important to point out that, even though not all the participants were born in Croatia (some are from Derventa, Prijedor, Ljubuški which are in Bosnia and Herzegovina), when asked about their nationality all of them stated they were Croatian and that their first language

was always Croatian. Reasons for leaving are various: from better job prospects to education and marriage.

All of the participants, regardless of the time spent abroad, stay in touch with their families in Croatia and they exclusively use Croatian when contacting them. Moreover, when asked how often they spoke Croatian since moving to another country, five out of nine said they use it daily and the rest said 2-3 times a week. Finally, when asked about their feelings about Croatian language, all the participants answered that they find it important to maintain their level of knowledge and that all of them will pass the language onto their children and practice it as if it is equally important as the language of the country they live in now. However, when asked about the culture they live in, the participants from Group B answered that they feel closer to the one they live in now than to Croatian. The cause must be the years spent in that surrounding because the majority of the Group A answered that they still feel closer to Croatian culture.

Eight out of nine participants are married but not all of the spouses are Croatian. However, if they are, they still communicate only in Croatian which may be one of the reasons why their bonds to Croatian are so strong.

Now, in spite of all love for their L1 and efforts to maintain the level of knowledge high, all of the participants admitted they noticed certain decline in their knowledge. The following tables will present the estimations of their L1 and L2 before and after they left Croatia.

Table 6 – Self-assessment of the knowledge of L2 before moving to L2 speaking country

	L2 before moving to L2 speaking country		
	Group A	Group B	All participants
Excellent	✓		1
Very good	✓✓✓		3
Good			
Basic		✓✓✓	3
Poor			
Very poor	✓	✓	2

Insufficient			
--------------	--	--	--

Table 7 - Self- assessment of the knowledge of L2 today

	L2 today		
	Group A	Group B	All participants
Excellent	✓✓✓	✓	4
Very good	✓✓	✓✓	4
Good		✓	1
Basic			
Poor			
Very poor			

The results are not surprising – all of the participants noticed progress in their L2 after living in the L2 country. Only 4 of the participants evaluated their knowledge as excellent or very good before they arrived, whereas today 8 of them claim that their knowledge of L2 is excellent or very good. Maybe the lower levels of knowledge noticeable in the Group B in table 6 could be assigned to the fact that they had poorer education than Group A as Jaspaert& Kroon (1989) also claim, but one cannot go deeper into that matter due to the lack of relevant information.

Table 8 – Self- assessment of the knowledge of L1 (Croatian) before the participants moved to another country

	L1 before moving to another country
--	-------------------------------------

	Group A	Group B	All participants
Excellent	✓✓✓	✓✓✓✓	7
Very good	✓		1
Good	✓		1
Basic			
Poor			
Very poor			
Insufficient			

Table 9 – Self- assessment of the knowledge of L1 today

	L1 today		
	Group A	Group B	All participants
Excellent	✓✓	✓	3
Very good	✓✓	✓	3
Good	✓	✓✓	3
Basic			
Poor			
Very poor			
Insufficient			

Before they left Croatia, one person thought his level of knowledge was good, one person thought it was very good and 7 of them thought it was excellent. This is not unusual given it is their first language; they used it daily and for all purposes – for work, education, entertainment etc.

The difference between the statuses of the participants' L1 is not radical, but it is meaningful. Out of 7 people who claimed their Croatian was excellent after they moved, only 3 keep claiming it is still excellent. If we take a better look at Group B specifically, we will see that they all estimated their Croatian as excellent in the moment of their departure, whereas today,

around 30 years after, only one person still believes it is excellent, one thinks it is very good, and the remaining two see it as merely good. This implies that new environment, new culture, and new language affect the first language to the extent that people notice it themselves. It affects their level of knowledge even if they are emotionally bound to L1 and try to maintain it. A great majority of participants said they always use Croatian to speak to their families and that they often use it to speak to their friends. On the other hand, when asked about the dynamics of usage of their L2, the majority answered it was reserved for work, shopping or other similar activities. Furthermore, majority of the participants said they listened to Croatian music and read Croatian books and news (on internet portals).

The following questions in the questionnaire are very individual and therefore give the best image of individual participant's relationship to their L1.

Table 10- In which language do you think?

	Group A	Group B	All participants
Only in Croatian	✓	✓	2
Mostly in Croatian	✓		1
In both	✓✓✓		3
Mostly in L2		✓✓	2
Only in L2		✓	1

Table 11 – In which language do you dream?

	Group A	Group B	All participants
Only in Croatian	✓✓	✓	3
Mostly in Croatian			
In both	✓✓		2
Mostly in L2	✓	✓✓✓	4

Only in L2			
------------	--	--	--

Table 12 – Which language do you use intuitively?

	Group A	Group B	All participants
Only Croatian		✓	1
Mostly Croatian	✓		1
Both	✓✓✓✓		4
Mostly L2		✓✓	2
Only L2		✓	1

These aspects are the ones people are rarely able to influence consciously.

When asked in which language they thought, 3 participants were ‘neutral’ – they said in both languages. 3 registered Croatian and 3 registered their L2. When it comes to even more ‘unconscious’ personal aspects as dreams and intuition, the results are on the side of the second language. L2 becomes dominant which inevitably leads to the attrition of L1 since it is not represented enough. When asked about the language in which they dream, 2 of the participants answered ‘both’, 3 answered Croatian and 4 answered L2. Similar results come from the table 12 which states the 4 people use both languages intuitively, two of them use Croatian intuitively and 3 of them use their L2.

When it comes to different types of language use, such as counting, using slang, making jokes, swearing, praying, the results are very neutral.

	Group A	Group B	All participants
Only Croatian	✓✓	✓	3

Mostly Croatian			
Both	✓✓✓	✓✓	5
Mostly L2		✓	1
Only L2			

Table 13 – Which language do you use to count?

Mental calculation seemed perfect to illustrate the power of L1 because when one has to count something very fast, the mind will switch to the language where this is least demanding, language in which this is done almost automatically. It is interesting that the majority of people said they can do it in both languages; however there is still a 3:1 ratio in the favor of Croatian language being the one that will perform this action. This result can be compared to the analysis Dewaele made from his research (2004) –he also claims L1 dominance affects heavily silent speech and mental calculation.

Table 14 – In which language do you swear (curse)?

	Group A	Group B	All participants
Only Croatian	✓✓		2
Mostly Croatian	✓	✓✓	3
Both	✓✓		2
Mostly L2		✓	1
Only L2		✓	1

Cursing is again one of the things people do almost automatically. We rarely think of the ‘emotional force of swearwords’, as Jean-Marc Dewaele puts it (2004). In the situations when people would usually curse, for example, if they accidentally broke someone’s vase or if they hurt their toe by hitting the furniture, they will curse in the language which seems most natural to them. The results show that as well - two people curse in both languages, 2 people do it in their L2, but the majority, five people out of nine will do it in Croatian.

Table 15 – Which language do you use to pray?

	Group A	Group B	All participants
Only Croatian	✓✓✓	✓	4
Mostly Croatian	✓	✓✓✓	4
Both	✓		1
Mostly L2			
Only L2			

Praying is one of the most private rituals a person does. If a person is religious, this aspect is deeply rooted in their personality and this is the main reason why it is done mostly in L1. As we can see in the Table 14, four out of nine participants said they prayed only in Croatian, other four said they did it mostly in Croatian, and only one does it in both languages. Praying, being one of most profound actions people do, is also closely connected to our L1, the language which we were born into, the one we used first.

Table 16 – In which language is it easier for you to make jokes?

	Group A	Group B	All participants
Only Croatian			
Mostly Croatian	✓	✓	1

Both	✓✓✓✓	✓	5
Mostly L2		✓	1
Only L2		✓	1

Table 17 - In which language is it easier to use slang?

	Group A	Group B	All participants
Only Croatian	✓	✓✓	3
Mostly Croatian			
Both	✓✓✓		3
Mostly L2	✓	✓	2
Only L2		✓	1

Using slang and making jokes were put into the same category. Both are basically skills one can learn to do in another language, especially during a longer period of time. The results are very homogenized. Almost 50% of the participants believe they can make jokes in both languages while the rest is evenly divided between L1 and L2. When it comes to using slang, the results are even more neutral – one third opted for L1, one third opted for L2 and the last third opted for both languages.

Although it seems that the majority of the participants do not exhibit signs of severe attrition, the fact that some of the participants repeatedly stated they use the L2 intuitively, make jokes and swear in L2 can be an indicator that their L1 has undergone certain stages of attrition. .

Finally, not one of these factors can be a firm proof that language attrition is certain but they can most definitely serve as indicators that the level of the first language is no longer as high as it used to be and this is a phenomenon worth exploring.

Participants' personal impressions

When asked to elaborate in their own words why it is more comfortable for them to use their L1 or L2, depending on which they chose, different answers were documented.

“Osjećam se ugodnije koristeći hrvatski jezik jer je to moja materinji jezik koji je najbolje poznajem i govorim, jezik kojeg sam odrasla.”

„Mogu se bolje izraziti, bilo da je riječ o poslu, emocijama ili jednostavnom razgovoru.”

As Bond & Lai (1986) explained, some people still consider their L1 to be the best tool to express their emotions. There are people who will never consider their L2 as *their* language, even though they use it for everyday activities. There are philosophers who argue that even expressing emotions in your own first language is in a way second-hand action, because not even your first language consists of words that can cover everything you wish to express, everything you feel. As already mentioned when analyzing the language which the participants use to pray, such bonds, between religion and language, and language and feelings are very deep and hardest to convert.

However, there are people who are able to do it, which depends on various factors - on how strongly you feel about your L1, how much time has passed since you left your L1 speaking country, how frequently and intensively you use your L1 etc. In the questionnaire there was one such answer:

“Jasam već dugogodina u inozemstvu, ja razmišljam na engleskom. Moram se skoncentrirati kad govorim hrvatski, ne mogu se sjetiti riječi koju hoću reći, pogotovo ako razgovaram hrvatski s nepoznatom osobom.”

The effects of language attrition are obvious here, not only did the participant explicitly say that she has to concentrate hard to use Croatian, but there are also irregularities in the linguistic expression which a fluent speaker of Croatian would not make. Both Weltens (1989) and Pavlenko (2000) argue that one of the main indicators of language attrition is precisely the inability to retrieve a certain word when needed but that this is only one of the stages of language attrition process, the one which points to vocabulary loss.

Final thoughts on the L1 attrition study

The results of L1 attrition questionnaire point to the fact that the majority of participants experienced a certain degree of language attrition which is clearly visible from the

participants' self-evaluations. Most of these people said they still used Croatian but mostly just to contact their relatives. The participants who said that they do not feel a big difference in their knowledge of Croatian today and when they left Croatia also stated that Croatian is very important to them and that they try to cherish it daily. It is hard to uniformly address this matter because the personal attitude of each individual plays a very significant role in the process of language attrition and because of this the process of language attrition will significantly differ in its intensity, speed and efficiency.

STUDY OF L2 ATTRITION

Aims

The starting assumption of L2 attrition is that it is a result of language negligence, i.e. of not using the L2 after the process of formal learning has stopped. The main aim of this part of the study was to see how the participants evaluated their current level of L2 knowledge in relation to the knowledge they had while the L2 learning process was still going on, and in order to make some tentative conclusions about the L2 attrition process.

Sample

The sample comprised of a group of 15 participants- ten female and five male. All of them were born in 1988 in Zagreb, Croatia, and they all attended the same school, Sesvete high school. Alongside Croatian, in school they all learned English for approximately 12 years and Italian for 4 years. Minority of participants learned German for about a year. Eleven of them specified BA as their final completed education degree, two of them specified high school and two had MA degree. After they finished high school where they learned Italian, only three participants had additional classes of Italian in their own arrangement. When asked to evaluate how frequently they used Italian after finishing high school until present, ten specified they never used it, whereas five said they used it rarely. Basically, the sample is made of people who spent 4 years studying Italian, from 2003 to 2007, but have (almost) never used it since.

Instruments

The questionnaire (see Appendix 2) made for L2 Italian users is based on self-assessment. After an introduction about the purpose of the questionnaire, there were a couple of questions about past education – highest education level achieved, high school, after high school education experiences, etc. The following sections dealt mostly with the participants' attitudes towards Italian – whether they use it and how frequently, whether they understand it today and to what extent, and how their attitude affects their level of knowledge. Both quantitative and qualitative data were used in the analysis. Also, Likert scale was used to assess the attitude towards certain aspects of language learning which gave a clearer image of what the participants thought. They were asked to rate certain statements on a scale from 1 to 5; 1 meaning strongly agree and 5 meaning strongly disagree.

Procedure

The study was conducted on 9 January 2014 via e-mail. All the copies of completed questionnaires are available for further analysis and checking.

Results

As already mentioned, the sample consisted of a group of 15 people who learned Italian in high school in the period between 2003 and 2007. After that time, they mostly never used it again. Through a series of questions referring to different aspects of language use, it was reasonable to conclude that the participants L2 underwent certain stages of attrition.

Although all of the participants had a practice of learning languages (Croatian, English, Latin which were obligatory in high school), the results of this questionnaire showed that regardless of the fact they were surrounded with different languages (some of them still are), their knowledge of Italian became worse since they never used it after school.

The first information needed to be able to get an idea of the level of the Italian language knowledge during high school were the grades. I asked for an average grade during their high school education. Out of fifteen people, seven said they had an A, six said they had a B and two said they had a C. As for the question regarding the frequency of use, ten participants said they have never used it after high school and five said they used it rarely.

To get a broader image of how the participants feel about Italian in everyday life, especially in media, a Likert scale was used. The statements were related to watching an Italian movie without any subtitles. Firstly, the results showed that the participants would never opt for watching an Italian movie if there were no subtitles. One of the problems is the fact that the actors speak too fast and the participants don't have enough time and experience to completely understand what the actors are expressing. Most of the participants agreed on this one. When asked if they ever took a moment to think about a certain word or memorize a word they heard, the participants in general said they would not do that in Italian. The same happened when they were asked to assess whether they ever think about a certain verb tense when they notice it.

However, when it comes to orthography, eight out of fifteen participants said they would be able to write down the lyrics of a song slowly dictated to them in Italian. They admit that they would, nonetheless, have a lot of mistakes.

When it comes to more complex linguistic tasks, such as writing a short essay (no longer than a page), most of the participants claim that they would not be able to do it successfully. They

were asked to assess how they would be graded on the basis of a short essay on a topic they chose. Ten said they would fail the task, two said they would get a D, and three said they would get a C. The results for writing a text are worse because writing a text is a more complex process and it demands a lot of language knowledge – from orthography to syntax and grammar- which evidently fades after a couple of years of not using a language. These results were expected because most of the linguists claim that production tasks are the true measure for language attrition and that this is the most accurate method to see just how serious language attrition is.

All in all, in their own words and as a final conclusion of this analysis, all of the participants have lost a significant part of their Italian language knowledge. The following tables will explicitly show in numbers how the participants felt they knew Italian at the end of their formal education in 2007 and how they feel about it at the time the study was conducted.

Table 18 - How would you assess your knowledge of Italian at the end of your education, in 2007?

	Number of participants	Percent
No knowledge		
Very poor	✓✓	13,3 %
Poor	✓✓	13,3 %
Basic	✓✓✓✓✓	33,3 %
Good	✓✓	13,3 %
Very Good	✓✓	13,3 %
Excellent	✓✓	13,3 %

Table 19 – How would you assess your knowledge of Italian today, in 2014?

	Number of participants	Percent
--	------------------------	---------

No knowledge		
Very poor	✓✓✓✓✓✓✓✓	53,3 %
Poor	✓✓✓	20 %
Basic	✓✓✓	20 %
Good		
Very Good	✓	6,6 %
Excellent		

The difference is definitely noticeable. While in 2007 only 4 participants graded their knowledge as poor or very poor, in 2014 this evaluation changed for 7 more people. Eleven out of fifteen, or, 73 % of that participants believe that their knowledge of Italian today is poor or very poor.

However, there was one question that was particularly interesting and it concerns the things that did stuck in the participants' minds after learning Italian. They were asked if there were any words that they still remember and if they could write those words down. The words were completely random, from *BabboNatale*= *Santa Clause* to *purtoppo* =*sadly*, but they show that some chunks of language do stay hidden in minds even years after learning. According to Bahrick (1984), this is called permastore content, or rather the content that, if remained in their mind until now, will remain for years to come. It will probably not vanish as the rest of the knowledge did.

Participants' personal impressions

This section might reveal one of the most important factors which fosters language attrition. This factor is motivation, or rather, lack of motivation. These are the words of one of the participants:

“ Ne volim talijanski, nikad ganisam volio, nikad ganisam znao ni tić u ga ikad znati. Ali pročitao sam dva puta Gazzetta dello sport i pogledao sezonu Caprijana HRT-u, zbogodlične radnje iz godnih žena, naravno, ne zbog talijanskog.”

Although people's attitudes towards particular languages are not crucial in language attrition research, Gardner and Lambert (1972) claim that motivation and attitude have powerful influence on language learning, and that these factors might be applicable to language attrition as well. When asked if they cared about their knowledge of Italian, most of the participants answered that they really don't care. The participants almost never read anything in Italian, they prefer any other type of music over the Italian, they rarely watch Italian movies and they never bothered to make progress in learning Italian after school, although they had good grounds. It is reasonable to expect that their knowledge of Italian will be deteriorating since the participants lack the very first factor in any language learning process- motivation.

Conducting a L2 attrition research is a very complex process. Through a self-evaluation questionnaire we only get the participants' idea of the level of their knowledge which is useful at the initial level of the language attrition research, but someone's own vision of their own knowledge does not always have to coincide with the real condition. Based on this limited study, several conclusions can be made. During schooling, all of the participants had almost twice as better grades and knowledge that they feel they currently do and this may be the result of many factors. At that time of formal education the participants were much more involved in learning, they were acquiring different information on a daily basis, they were simultaneously learning three different languages, and they were cognitively mature enough to be able to do all the intellectual tasks they were asked to do. However, today, when most of the participants already finished their education, they no longer have any similar learning activity and, most importantly, since they are not bound to use Italian for their job or any other activity, they do not really care whether this knowledge evaporates or not. These factors certainly influenced their L2 knowledge.

Conclusion and suggestion for further research

Language attrition is the phenomenon of language loss. It differs on the basis of the language it concerns, L1 or L2 (or any other). The degree of language attrition varies and depends on numerous factors, most of which I mentioned in this work. While reading the literature for this thesis and while writing it, I encountered many dead ends, regardless of the fact whether they concern methodology, theoretical knowledge or practical experiences, which is just another proof that this phenomenon is far from being fully explained.

Both of the conducted studies mostly confirmed the findings I found in the relevant literature, but since my studies were based on self-assessment, I believe that they require additional, linguistically oriented questions in order to be useful in a theoretical way. Language attrition, especially in L1, is very hard to detect, monitor and explain. Research done in this field is often complex, and yet still incomplete because there are so many factors to be taken into consideration.

All in all, hopefully, studies carried out in the future will provide more information on the phenomenon's definition and manifestations because today we do not have all the information we need to understand how language attrition functions or if the effects can be reduced in some way.

Glavni je cilj ovog rada definirati fenomen jezičnog nazadovanja te istražiti njegove uzroke i posljedice koristeći se kvalitativnim i kvantitativnom podacima iz upitnika. Istraživanje nazadovanja materinjeg jezika je provedeno u prosincu 2013. godine među 9 sudionika koji hrvatski smatraju svojim materinjim jezikom. S obzirom na to da se istraživanje zasniva na samoevaluaciji, ispitanici su morali iznijeti svoj stav prema materinjem jeziku nakon odlaska iz domovine. Uključeni su i faktori učestalosti korištenja hrvatskog jezika nakon odlaska te samoevaluacija vlastitog poimanja razine znanja. Rezultati istraživanja su potvrdili pretpostavku da je stav prema jeziku jako važan u procesu jezičnog nazadovanja, međutim, bez obzira na to koliko je povezanost s materinjim jezikom jaka, svi su ispitanici priznali kako je razina znanja hrvatskog jezika danas manja nego kad su ovdje živjeli što ukazuje na određeni stupanj jezičnog nazadovanja. Istraživanje nazadovanja stranog jezika je provedeno u Zagrebu, također u prosincu 2013. godine među 15 ispitanika. Samoevaluacijom je utvrđenatrenutna razina znanja talijanskog jezika (stranog jezika koji su učili svi ispitanici) te je uspoređena s razinom znanja iz vremena kad su ispitanici aktivno učili taj jezik. Motivacija za učenjem i korištenjem jezika je ispitana putem pitanja o upotrebi talijanskog jezika kroz različite medije kojima se možda ispitanici koriste kako bi se utvrdilo koliku ona ulogu ima u jezičnom nazadovanju. Kvantitativni pristup i osobni dojmovi ispitanika ukazali su na to da je njihovo znanje barem duplo slabije danas te da je glavni uzrok tome zanemarivanje jezika. Stupanj jezičnog nazadovanja, dakle, varira i ovisi o mnogim faktorima te bi svi oni trebali biti zastupljeni u budućim istraživanjima.

Ključne riječi –nazadovanje materinjeg jezika, nazadovanje stranog jezika, samoevaluacija, zanemarivanje jezika.

Reference list:

- Bahrack, H.P. 1984. Fifty years of language attrition: Implications for programmatic research. *Modern Language Journal* 68: 105-116.
- Berman, R.A., & Olshtain, E. (1983). „Features of first language transfer in second language attrition“. *Applied Linguistics*, 4(3), 222-234.
- Bond, M., & Lai, T.-M (1986). „Embarrassment and code-switching into a second language“. *The Journal of Social Psychology*, 126, 179-186.
- Dewaele, J.-M. (Forthcoming b). „The emotional force of swearwords and taboo words in the speech of multilinguals“. Special issue of the *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development* (2004).
- Dewaele, J.-M. (Forthcoming b). „The emotional force of swearwords and taboo words in the speech of multilinguals“. Special issue of the *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development* (2004).
- Els, T. Van (1986) „An overview of European research on language attrition“. In B. Weltens, K. de Bot & T. Van Els (Eds.), *Language Attrition in Progress* (pp. 3-18). Dordrecht: Foris.
- Fromm, E. (1970). „Age regression with unexpected reappearance of a repressed childhood language“. *International Journal of Clinical and Experimental Hypnosis*, 18, 79-88.
- Gardner, R. C. & Lambert, W.E. (1972). *Attitudes and Motivation in Second Language Learning*. Rowley, MA: Newbury House.
- Hansen, L. & Reetz-Kurashige, A. 1999. Investigating second language attrition: An introduction. In *Second Language Attrition: Evidence from Japanese Contexts*, L. Hansen (ed-), 3-20. Oxford: OUP.
- Harley, B., & Wang, W. (1997). „The critical period hypothesis: Where are we now?“ In A. M. B. de Groot & J. F. Kroll (Eds.) *Tutorials in Bilingualism. Psycholinguistic Perspectives* (pp. 19-52). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Jaspaert, K., & Kroon, S. (1989). „Social determinants of language loss“. *I.T.L.: Review of Applied Linguistics*, 83/84, 75-98.
- Kaufman, D. (1998). „Children’s assimilatory patterns and L1 attrition“. In A. Greenhill, M. Huges, H. Littlefield, & H. Walsh (Eds.), *Proceedings of the 22nd Annual Boston*

University Conference on Language Development, I, II (pp. 409-420). Somerville, MA: Cascadilla.

Kuhberg, H. (1992). „Longitudinal L2-attrition versus L2-acquisition, in three Turkish children – empirical findings“. *Second Language Research*, 8, 138-153.

Laufer, B. (2003). “The influence of L2 and L1 collocational knowledge and on L1 lexical diversity in free written expression”. In V. Cook (Ed.), *Effects of the Second Language on the First* (pp. 19-31). Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Neisser, U. 1984. Interpreting Harry Bahrick’s discovery: What confers immunity against forgetting? *Journal of Experimental Psychology: General* 113:32-35.

Novakovich, J., & Shapard. R. (Eds.) (2000). *Stories in the Stepmother Tongue*. Buffalo. NY: White Pine Press.

Olshtain, E. (1986). „The attrition of English as a second language with speakers of Hebrew“. In B. Weltens, K. de Bot, & T. van Els (Eds.), *Language Attrition in Progress* (pp. 187-204)-Dordrecht: Foris.

Pavlenko, A. (2000) “L2 influence on L1 in late bilingualism”. *Issues in Applied Linguistics*, 11 (2) 175-205.

Pavlenko, A. (2002) “Bilingualism and emotions.” *Multilingua*, 21 (1), 45-78.

Pavlenko, A. (2003a), „I feel clumsy speaking Russian“: L2 influence on L1 in narratives of Russian L2 users of English“. In V. Cook (Ed.) *Effects of the Second Language on the First* (pp. 32-61). Clevedon: Multilingual Patterns.

Pavlenko, A. (2003b). „Eyewitness memory in late bilinguals: Evidence for discursive relativity. “ *International Journal of Bilingualism*, 7 (3), 257-287.

Schmid, M. S., Köpke, B., Keijzer & Weimar, L. 2004. „First Language Attrition – Interdisciplinary perspectives on methodological issues“. *John Benjamin Publishing Company*.

Schmid, M. S., Köpke, B., Keijzer & Weimar, L. 2004. „First Language Attrition – Interdisciplinary perspectives on methodological issues“. *John Benjamin Publishing Company*.

Schmid, S. M., & Lowie, W. (2011). Modeling Bilingualism- from Structure to Chaos”.*John Benjamins Publishing Company*. 135-150.

Tao, H. & Thompson, S. (1991). “English backchannels in Mandarin conversations: A case study of superstratum pragmatic ‘indifference.’” *Journal of Pragmatics*, 16, 209-223.

Waas, M. (1996). *Language Attrition Downunder*. Frankfurt: Peter Lang.

Weltens, B., van Els, T.J.M. & Schils, E. 1989. The long term retention of French by Dutch students. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition* 11:205-216.

Web pages:

Schmid, M. S. (2013) The language attrition website. Retrieved November 2013. from <http://www.let.rug.nl/languageattrition/>.

Appendix A - Questionnaire on L1 attrition

Upitnik o nazadovanju u prvome jeziku

Ime:

Datum:

Glavni je cilj ovog upitnika dobiti uvid u korištenje jezika (materinjeg i onog koji je usvajan u novom okruženju) onih ispitanika koji su iz Hrvatske otišli živjeti u drugu državu. Podaci iz upitnika bit će korišteni isključivo za potrebe diplomskog rada 'Jezično nazadovanje – uzroci i posljedice' (eng. Language attrition – causes and consequences). Upitnik će ispunjavati samo oni ispitanici koji su u drugoj državi živjeli minimalno 6 mjeseci. Cilj upitnika je steći bolji uvid u način na koji intenzivno učenje drugog jezika u drugoj okolini utječe na materinji jezik. Ukoliko se bilo koje od pitanje ne odnosi na vas, molim stavite X.

1. Koji je vaš datum rođenja?

2. Spol? ☐muško ☐žensko

3. Gdje ste rođeni?

naselje: _____

grad: _____

država: _____

4. Koje ste nacionalnosti? _____

5. Koji je najviši stupanj obrazovanja koji ste završili?

☐osnovna škola

☐srednja škola, vrsta: _____

☐viša škola, vrsta: _____

☐fakultet, stupanj: _____

6. Koji ste jezike učili u školi ili sličnim obrazovnim ustanovama?

☐ hrvatski

☐ druge jezike:

7. Koliko ste dugo učili pojedini jezik?

☐ _____ (jezik) - _____ (mjeseci/godina)

☐ _____ (jezik) - _____ (mjeseci/godina)

☐ _____ (jezik) - _____ (mjeseci/godina)

☐ _____ (jezik) - _____ (mjeseci/godina)

☐ _____ (jezik) - _____ (mjeseci/godina)

8. Prije nego ste odselili iz Hrvatske, koliko ste mjeseci/godina učili jezik države u koji ste odselili unutar nekog obrazovnog programa?

9. Čime se trenutno bavite? _____

10. Jeste li ikada živjeli u nekoj drugoj državi osim Hrvatske više od 6 mjeseci?

☐ ne

☐ manje od godine dana u _____ (grad), _____ (država)

☐ godinu dana i više u _____ (grad), _____ (država)

11. Kad ste otišli iz Hrvatske? (godina) _____

12. Koji je razlog odlaska iz Hrvatske? ☐ posao ☐ partnerov posao ☐ partner ☐ drugo:

13. Vraćate li se natrag u Hrvatsku otkad ste otišli?

- ☐ nisam niti jednom
- ☐ rijetko
- ☐ redovito, 1-2 godišnje
- ☐ redovito, 3-5 godišnje
- ☐ redovito, više od 5 puta godišnje

14. U prosjeku, koliko često govorite hrvatski otkad živite u drugoj državi?

- ☐ svaki dan
- ☐ 2-3 puta tjedno
- ☐ jednom tjedno
- ☐ svaka dva tjedna
- ☐ jednom mjesečno
- ☐ svaka tri mjeseca
- ☐ svakih šest mjeseci
- ☐ više ne govorim hrvatski

15. Je li vam važno održavati svoje znanje hrvatskog?

- ☐ ne
- ☐ ne baš
- ☐ važno mi je
- ☐ da, jako mi je važno

16. Je li vam važno da i vaša djeca (ukoliko ih planirate imati) govore i razumiju hrvatski?

- ☐ ne

- ☐ne baš
- ☐važno mi je
- ☐da, jako mi je važno

17. Imate li, u prosjeku, više prijatelja koji govore hrvatski ili neki drugi jezik u državi u kojoj živite?

- ☐isključivo prijatelje koji govore drugi jezik
- ☐i jedne i druge, ali više prijatelja koji govore drugi jezik
- ☐i jednih i drugih podjednako
- ☐i jedne i druge, ali više prijatelja koji govore hrvatski
- ☐isključivo prijatelje koji govore hrvatski jezik

18. Je li vam bliža hrvatska kultura ili kultura u kojoj se sada nalazite?

- ☐kultura u kojoj se sad nalazim
- ☐obje, ali ipak malo više ova u kojoj se sada nalazim
- ☐podjednako su mi bliske obje kulture
- ☐obje, ali ipak malo više hrvatska
- ☐hrvatska kultura

19. Osjećate li se trenutno ugodnije kad razgovarate na hrvatskom ili na drugom jeziku u državi u kojoj živite?

- ☐na jeziku države u kojoj živim ☐na hrvatskom

20. Možete li, molim vas, pojasniti svoj odgovor: zašto se osjećate ugodnije koristeći hrvatski ili jezik države u kojoj živite?

21. Koji je vaš bračni status?

☐udana/oženjen ☐razveden/a ☐udovac/udovica ☐u vezi ☐samac

22. Koji je materinji jezik vašeg (bivšeg) partnera/ice?

☐hrvatski ☐jezik države u kojoj sad živim ☐drugi:

23. Ako se vaš (bivši) partner/ica nije rodio u državi u kojoj trenutno živite, koji je bio razlog njegova dolaska?

☐posao ☐posao partnera/ice ☐partner/ica ☐drugi:

24. Gdje ste se upoznali? ☐u državi u kojoj sada živim ☐u Hrvatskoj ☐drugo:

25. Kojim se jezikom služite u komunikaciji s (bivšim) partnerom/icom?

☐isključivo jezikom države u kojoj sad živim

☐i hrvatskim i jezikom države u kojoj živim, ali više se služim jezikom države u kojoj živim

☐u jednakoj mjeri i hrvatskim i jezikom države u kojoj živim

☐i hrvatskim i jezikom države u kojoj živim, ali više se služim hrvatskim

☐isključivo hrvatskim

26. Kojim se jezikom najviše služi vaš (bivši) partner/ica u komunikaciji s vama?

☐isključivo jezikom države u kojoj sad živim

☐i hrvatskim i jezikom države u kojoj živim, ali više se služim jezikom države u kojoj živim

☐u jednakoj mjeri i hrvatskim i jezikom države u kojoj živim

☐i hrvatskim i jezikom države u kojoj živim, ali više se služim hrvatskim

☐isključivo hrvatskim

27. Kontaktirate li često obitelj i prijatelje u Hrvatskoj?

☐jako rijetko ☐rijetko ☐ponekad ☐redovito ☐stalno

28. Na koji način održavate komunikaciju s obitelji i prijateljima u Hrvatskoj?

☐telefonom ☐pismima ☐e-mailom ☐na drugi način:

29. Kojim se jezikom služite u komunikaciji s obitelji i prijateljima u Hrvatskoj?

☐isključivo jezikom države u kojoj sad živim

☐i hrvatskim i jezikom države u kojoj živim, ali više se služim jezikom države u kojoj živim

☐u jednakoj mjeri i hrvatskim i jezikom države u kojoj živim

☐i hrvatskim i jezikom države u kojoj živim, ali više se služim hrvatskim

☐isključivo hrvatskim

30. Općenito gledajući, kako biste ocijenili vlastitu razinu znanja jezika države u koju ste odselili PRIJE nego što ste odselili?

☐nikakvo ☐jako slabo ☐slabo ☐osnovno ☐dobro ☐vrlo dobro ☐odlično

31. Općenito gledajući, kako biste danas ocijenili vlastitu razinu znanja jezika države u kojoj trenutno živite?

☐nikakvo ☐jako slabo ☐slabo ☐osnovno ☐dobro ☐vrlo dobro ☐odlično

32. Općenito gledajući, kako biste ocijenili vlastito znanje hrvatskoj jezika prije nego ste odselili?

☐nikakvo ☐jako slabo ☐slabo ☐osnovno ☐dobro ☐vrlo dobro ☐odlično

33. Općenito gledajući, kako biste danas ocijenili vlastito znanje hrvatskoj jezika?

☐nikakvo ☐jako slabo ☐slabo ☐osnovno ☐dobro ☐vrlo dobro ☐odlično

34. Jeste li stekli prijatelje u državi u kojoj živite? ☐da ☐ne

35. Ako jeste, koji je materinji jezik većine tih ljudi?

☐engleski ☐njemački ☐hrvatski ☐drugi: _____

36. Kako ste ih upoznali?

☐preko hrvatske organizacije

☐preko zajedničkih prijatelji

☐preko posla

☐preko obrazovnih institucija

☐drugo: _____

37. Ove tablice prikazuju različita područja korištenja jezika. Molim vas da naznačite do koje mjere koristiti hrvatski (tablica 1), a do koje mjere jezik države u kojoj živite (tablica 2) za svako pojedino područje. Jednostavno stavite kvačicu, a ukoliko se pojedino područje na vas ne odnosi, stavite X.

Služim se hrvatskim.					
	stalno	često	ponekad	rijetko	jako rijetko
u komunikaciji s obitelji					
u komunikaciji s prijateljima					
kad se obraćam ljubimcu					
na poslu					
u trgovini					

Služim se jezikom države u kojoj živim.					
	stalno	često	ponekad	rijetko	jako rijetko
u komunikaciji s obitelji					
u komunikaciji s prijateljima					
kad se					

obraćam ljubimcu					
na poslu					
u trgovini					

38. Jeste li ikada bili član nekog hrvatskog kluba ili organizacije u državi u kojoj živite?

☐ da, _____ (ime organizacije),
_____ (mjeseci/godina)

☐ ne

39. Nedostaje li vam nekad Hrvatska?

☐ da, najviše mi nedostaje/ju:

☐ ne

40. Slušate li ikada hrvatsku glazbu? ☐ da ☐ ne

41. Gledate li ikada hrvatsku televiziju? ☐ da ☐ ne ☐ volio bih, ali mi to nije dostupno

42. Slušate li ikada hrvatski radio? ☐ da ☐ ne ☐ volio bih, ali mi to nije dostupno

43. Čitate li ikada hrvatske novine, knjige ili časopise? ☐ da ☐ ne

44. Ako ste naznačili da nikada ne slušate hrvatsku glazbu ili radio, ne čitate hrvatske novine, knjige ili časopise te ne gledate hrvatsku televiziju, možete li pojasniti koji su razlozi tome?

45. Smatrate li da se vaša razina znanja hrvatskog promijenila otkad ste otišli iz Hrvatske?

- ☐ da, mislim da je slabije
- ☐ ne, mislim da je podjednako kako je i bilo
- ☐ da, mislim da je bolje

46. Smatrate li da se hrvatskim služite više ili manje otkad ste odselili?

- ☐ mislim da se manje služim hrvatskim
- ☐ ne smatram da se hrvatskim služim ni manje ni više
- ☐ mislim da se više služim hrvatskim

47. Osjećate li ponekad nelagodu kad se služite hrvatskim u komunikaciji s Hrvatima koji nikada nije živio u državi u kojoj vi živite?

- ☐ da, ponekad ☐ ne, nikada

48. Ukoliko ste naznačili da ponekad osjećate nelagodu, biste li naznačili osjećate li nelagodu također i kad razgovarate na hrvatskom s Hrvatima koji je jedan period živio u državi u kojoj i vi živite?

- ☐ da ☐ ne

49. Smatrate li da ste na podjednakoj razini znanja iz oba jezika koja koristite, dakle i hrvatskog i jezika države u kojoj živite?

- ☐ ne, bolje vladam jezikom države u kojoj živim
- ☐ da
- ☐ ne, bolje vladam hrvatskim
- ☐ ne znam jer _____

50. Biste li lakše pogodili društveni status neke osobe kada bi ta osoba govorila hrvatski ili jezik države u kojoj živite?

- ☐ jezik države u kojoj živim
- ☐ podjednako
- ☐ hrvatski

☐ne znam jer _____

51. Kako se osjećate kad čujete Hrvate (na primjer kao turiste) koji govore jezik države u kojoj živite sa snažnim hrvatskim naglaskom?

☐to mi smeta ☐ne predstavlja mi nikakav problem

52. Planirate li se ikada vratiti u Hrvatsku?

☐da, rado ću se jednom vratiti u Hrvatsku

☐ne

☐nisam o tome razmišljao/la

53. Ako ste naznačili da se ne planirate vratiti u Hrvatsku, možete li pojasniti zašto?

54. Kad pogledate unazad, smatrate li da ste otišavši iz Hrvatske učinili dobar korak?

☐da ☐ne, ne bih to ponovio da se mogu vratiti jer

☐ne znam jer

55. Na kojem jeziku najčešće razmišljate?

☐isključivo na hrvatskom

☐većinom na hrvatskom

☐na oba jezika

☐većinom na jeziku države u kojoj živim

☐isključivo na jeziku države u kojoj živim

56. Na kojem jeziku najčešće sanjate?

- ☐isključivo na hrvatskom
- ☐većinom na hrvatskom
- ☐na oba jezika
- ☐većinom na jeziku države u kojoj živim
- ☐isključivo na jeziku države u kojoj živim

57. Na kojem jeziku brojite?

- ☐isključivo na hrvatskom
- ☐većinom na hrvatskom
- ☐na oba jezika
- ☐većinom na jeziku države u kojoj živim
- ☐isključivo na jeziku države u kojoj živim

58. Na kojem se jeziku molite?

- ☐isključivo na hrvatskom
- ☐većinom na hrvatskom
- ☐na oba jezika
- ☐većinom na jeziku države u kojoj živim
- ☐isključivo na jeziku države u kojoj živim

59. Na kojem biste jeziku rekli da imate veći opseg vokabulara?

- ☐isključivo na hrvatskom
- ☐većinom na hrvatskom
- ☐na oba jezika

- ☐ većinom na jeziku države u kojoj živim
- ☐ isključivo na jeziku države u kojoj živim

60. U kojem jeziku nemate problema s izgovorom?

- ☐ isključivo na hrvatskom
- ☐ većinom na hrvatskom
- ☐ na oba jezika
- ☐ većinom na jeziku države u kojoj živim
- ☐ isključivo na jeziku države u kojoj živim

61. Koji jezik koristite intuitivno?

- ☐ isključivo hrvatski
- ☐ većinom hrvatski
- ☐ oba jezika
- ☐ većinom jezik države u kojoj živim
- ☐ isključivo jezik države u kojoj živim

62. U kojem se jeziku bolje služite *slangom*?

- ☐ isključivo hrvatskom
- ☐ većinom hrvatskom
- ☐ u oba jezika
- ☐ većinom u jeziku države u kojoj živim
- ☐ isključivo u jeziku države u kojoj živim

63. Kojim se jezikom služite kada se šalite?

- ☐ isključivo hrvatskim
- ☐ većinom hrvatskim
- ☐ s oba jezika
- ☐ većinom jezikom države u kojoj živim

☐isključivo jezikom države u kojoj živim

64. Na kojem jeziku najčešće psujete?

☐isključivo na hrvatskom

☐većinom na hrvatskom

☐na oba jezika

☐većinom na jeziku države u kojoj živim

☐isključivo na jeziku države u kojoj živim

65. Uz koji ste jezikom više emocionalno vezani?

☐uz isključivo hrvatski

☐uz većinom hrvatski

☐uz oba jezika

☐uz većinom jezik države u kojoj živim

☐uz isključivo jezik države u kojoj živim

66. Ovo je kraj upitnika. Imate li još bilo što dodati? Rado ću prihvatiti bilo kakav komentar vezan uz jezik, upitnik ili samo istraživanje.

Zahvaljujem na izdvojenom vremenu i trudu uloženom u ispunjavanje.

Dorotea

Appendix B – Questionnaire on L2 attrition

Upitnik

Datum:

Glavni je cilj ovog upitnika dobiti uvid u korištenje stranog jezika koji je ispitanik učio barem 4 godine, te se zatim prestao tim jezikom aktivno koristiti. Podaci iz upitnika bit će korišteni isključivo za potrebe diplomskog rada 'Jezično nazadovanje – uzroci i posljedice' (eng. Language attrition – causes and consequences).

Ukoliko se bilo koje od pitanje ne odnosi na vas, stavite X. Moguće je označiti više odgovora.

1. Gdje ste rođeni?

grad: _____

država: _____

2. Koje ste nacionalnosti? _____

3. Koji je najviši stupanj obrazovanja koji ste završili?

☐ osnovna škola

☐ srednja škola, vrsta: _____

☐ viša škola, vrsta: _____

☐ fakultet, stupanj: _____

4. Koji ste jezike učili u školi ili sličnim obrazovnim ustanovama?

☐ hrvatski

☐ druge jezike:

5. Koliko ste dugo učili pojedini jezik?

☐ _____ (jezik) - _____ (mjeseci/godina)

☐ _____ (jezik) - _____ (mjeseci/godina)

☐ _____ (jezik) - _____ (mjeseci/godina)

☐ _____ (jezik) - _____ (mjeseci/godina)

☐ _____ (jezik) - _____ (mjeseci/godina)

6. Koja vam je bila prosječna ocjena iz talijanskog jezika tijekom obrazovanja?

☐ nedovoljan

☐ dovoljan

☐ dobar

☐ vrlo dobar

☐ odličan

7. Koje ste godine završili obrazovanje? _____

8. Jeste li tijekom obrazovanja ili po završetku upisivali kakav dodatni tečaj talijanskog jezika (privatnu poduku, školu stranih jezika i sl.)?

Ako jeste, koliko ste dugo još naknadno učili talijanski? _____

9. U prosjeku, koliko često se koristite talijanskim jezikom u svakodnevnom životu?

☐ stalno

☐ često

☐ rijetko

☐ nikada

10. Jeste li nakon završetka obrazovanja ikada bili u prilici služiti se talijanskim jezikom za potrebe posla ili slično (napisati životopis na talijanskom, molbu za posao, osvrt, kritiku, itd)?

☐ da, _____ (*navedite o čemu je riječ*)

☐ ne

11. Zamislite da gledate film na talijanskom jeziku BEZ hrvatskih podnatpisa. Naznačite bilo kojom bojom osim crne u kojoj mjeri se slažete s pojedinom tvrdnjom ako uzmemo u obzir da **1** znači **U potpunosti se slažem**, a **5** znači **Nikako se ne slažem**?

- Obično ne razumijem što govore jer prebrzo pričaju 1 2 3 4 5
- Podnatpisi mi nisu toliko važni, mogu pogledati film i bez njih 1 2 3 4 5
- Smeta mi što ne razumijem svaku riječ 1 2 3 4 5
- Ponekad razmišljam o pojedinim riječima koje su spomenute 1 2 3 4 5
- Ponekad pokušavam zapamtiti određenu riječ 1 2 3 4 5
- Ponekad primjetim određeno glagolsko vrijeme i barem kratko razmislim o njemu 1 2 3 4 5
- Ako nema hrvatskih podnatpisa, vjerojatno neću ni pogledati film 1 2 3 4 5
-

12. Mislite li da bi se rezultati razlikovali u odnosu na vrijeme kada ste aktivno učili talijanski jezik?

☐ mislim da bih tada imao/la bolje rezultata

☐ mislim da je razina znanja podjednaka danas i tada

☐ mislim da bih danas imao/la bolje rezultate

13. U prosjeku, koliko često čitate vijesti ili članke s internetskih portala koji su na talijanskom jeziku?

- ☐svaki dan
- ☐2-3 puta tjedno
- ☐jednom tjedno
- ☐jednom mjesečno
- ☐gotovo nikad
- ☐odustanem kad vidim da je na engleskom

14. Ako ste čitali barem jednom tekst na talijanskom jeziku (bez obzira je li riječ o knjigama, internetskim portalima, časopisima ili slično), ocijenite u kojoj vam je mjeri smetala pojedina pojava koja je ovdje navedena.

- smeta mi što ne razumijem svaku riječ 1 2 3 4 5
- ponekad mi je teško pratiti o čemu se radi ako je dugačak tekst 1 2 3 4 5
- ponekad se dogodi da shvatim što određena riječ znači tek kad ju netko ispravno pročita na glas 1 2 3 4 5
- ponekad ne razumijem što se na što odnosi u nekim rečenicama 1 2 3 4 5

15. Kad slušate glazbu na talijanskom jeziku, koliko, u prosjeku, razumijete tekst pjesama?

- ☐gotovo ništa ne razumijem
- ☐razumijem malo
- ☐neke stvari razumijem, neke ne
- ☐razumijem dosta
- ☐obično sve razumijem

16. Kada bi vam netko polako diktirao tekst pjesme koja vam je poznata, mislite li da biste ju mogli ispravno zapisati na talijanskom jeziku?

- ☐ da ☐ ne

17. Što mislite, koliko biste to uspješno napravili?

- ☐mislim da bih sve točno napisao
- ☐mislim da bih imao nekoliko grešaka

☐ mislim da bih imao dosta grešaka

☐ mislim da bi gotovo sve bilo pogrešno napisano

18. Preferirate li glazbu na:

☐ hrvatskom jeziku

☐ talijanskom jeziku

☐ _____ jeziku

19. Procijenite koliko se dobro koristite talijanskim jezikom u svakom od sljedećih područja.

1 znači **da se ne služite uopće talijanskim u pojedinom području**, a **5** znači **da se bez problema služite talijanskim u pojedinom području**.

-gledajući filmove 1 2 3 4 5

-slušajući glazbu 1 2 3 4 5

-čitajući članke s internetskih portala 1 2 3 4 5

-koristeći društvene mreže (Facebook, Twitter...) 1 2 3 4 5

-sporazumijevajući se u inozemstvu 1 2 3 4 5

- igrajući video-igrice 1 2 3 4 5

- čitajući knjige na talijanskom jeziku 1 2 3 4 5

- čitajući upute (za društvenu igru, npr.) 1 2 3 4 5

20. Je li vam važno održavati svoje znanje talijanskog jezika?

☐ ne

- ☐ ne baš
- ☐ važno mi je
- ☐ da, jako mi je važno

21. Imate li među svojim poznanicima nekoga s kim komunicirate isključivo na talijanskom jeziku?

- ☐ da
- ☐ ne

22. Postoje li neke riječi ili izrazi na talijanskom jeziku koje pamтите, a naučili ste ih tijekom obrazovanja?

- ☐ da
- ☐ ne

Ako da, navedite ih. _____

23. Općenito gledajući, kako biste ocijenili vlastitu razinu znanja talijanskog jezika po završetku obrazovanja?

- ☐ nikakvo ☐ jako slabo ☐ slabo ☐ osnovno ☐ dobro ☐ vrlo dobro ☐ odlično

24. Općenito gledajući, kako biste danas ocijenili vlastitu razinu znanja talijanskog jezika danas?

- ☐ nikakvo ☐ jako slabo ☐ slabo ☐ osnovno ☐ dobro ☐ vrlo dobro ☐ odlično

25. Kada biste danas morali napisati kratki esej na talijanskom jeziku (od najviše jedne stranice) o nekoj aktualnoj temi koja vam je poznata, koju ocjenu mislite da biste dobili iz eseja?

- ☐ odličan
- ☐ vrlo dobar
- ☐ dobar
- ☐ dovoljan
- ☐ nedovoljan

26. Smatrate li da se razina znanja talijanskog jezika promijenila otkako ste završili školovanje?

☐ da, mislim da je slabije

☐ ne, mislim da je podjednako kako je i bilo

☐ da, mislim da je bolje

27. Od završetka obrazovanja do danas, koji vam aspekt korištenja talijanskog jezika najviše pomaže u napredovanju u jeziku? Molim, odaberite samo jedan odgovor.

☐ slušanje glazbe na talijanskom jeziku

☐ gledanje filmova na talijanskom jeziku

☐ čitanje članaka i portala na talijanskom jeziku

☐ komunikacija sa strancima

☐ video-igrice na talijanskom

☐ nešto drugo:

28. Ovo je kraj upitnika. Imate li još bilo što dodati? Rado ću prihvatiti bilo kakav komentar vezan uz jezik, upitnik ili samo istraživanje.

Zahvaljujem na izdvojenom vremenu i trudu uloženom u ispunjavanje.

Dorotea